

Serial No. **10/673,282**

Docket No. **YHK-0120**

Amtdt. dated August 31, 2006

Reply to Office Action of June 7, 2006

### **REMARKS**

By the present response, Applicants have submitted new claim 22 for consideration by the Examiner and assert that this claim does not contain any prohibited new matter. Applicants have canceled claim 11 without disclaimer. Further, Applicants have amended claims 1-6, 8-10, 12, 14 and 16 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1-10 and 12-22 remain pending in this application. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In the Office Action, claim 21 has been objected to because of informalities. Claims 1-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,023,406 (Nunomura). Claims 1-21 are provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-12, 17, 22, 26 and 31-36 of co-pending application 10/947,334.

#### **Claim Objections**

Claim 21 has been objected to because of informalities. This claim was amended in a preliminary amendment filed concurrently with the present application. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that this objection be withdrawn.

#### **35 U.S.C. 102 Rejections**

Claims 1-21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Nunomura et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Nunomura et al. discloses a plasma display device which implements a peak luminance higher than prior art, reduces the power dissipation, improves the smoothness of gradation display, and conducts clear display suitable especially for TV display. By setting a plurality of APL levels according to the average value of the scene brightness, and by shortening a sustaining pulse period and increasing the number of sustaining pulses of each sub-field in APL levels having small APL, the peak luminance is raised. Further, by making the sustaining pulse period long in APL levels having large APL requiring large discharge light emission power, the light emission efficiency is improved and the maximum power dissipation is reduced. The luminance distribution in the scene when the APL level is small is detected. On the basis of that information, setting of the number of sustaining pulses and the sustaining pulse period is changed in the same APL level. As a result the peak luminance is increased, and the gradation smoothness in the dark scene is improved.

Regarding claims 1, 12, 14 and 16, Applicants submit that Nunomura et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, *inter alia*, setting the number of sustaining pulses in response to an average picture level, setting a period of each sustaining pulse in proportion to the average picture level where the period of the sustaining pulse is changed in a stepwise manner in accordance with the average picture level as the average picture level goes from a first level into a second level or where the period to the sustaining pulse is increased in a stepwise manner in accordance with the average picture level as

Serial No. 10/673,282

Docket No. YHK-0120

Amtdt. dated August 31, 2006

Reply to Office Action of June 7, 2006

the average picture level goes from a lower level into a higher level. The Examiner asserts that Nunomura et al. discloses these limitations in Figs. 1, 3, 4, and 8. However, these figures merely disclose that the number of sustaining pulses increases as the APL level increases and that the sustaining pulse period is either 4.0 microseconds or 2.7 microseconds dependent on the APL level. This is not the period of the sustaining pulse being changed or increased in a stepwise manner in accordance with the average picture level as the average picture level goes from a first level or lower level into a second level or higher level, as recited in the claims of the present application. The figures in Nunomura et al. merely disclose that the sustaining pulse period may be different for a group of different APL levels. This is not the sustaining pulse being changed or increased in a stepwise manner as the average picture level goes from a lower level into a higher level.

Regarding claims 2-10, 13, 15 and 17-22, Applicants submit that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1, 12, 14, 16 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that Nunomura et al. does not disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1-10 and 12-22 of the present application. Applicants respectfully request that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Serial No. **10/673,282**

Docket No. **YHK-0120**

Amdt. dated August 31, 2006

Reply to Office Action of June 7, 2006

Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1-21 have been provisionally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claim 1-12, 17, 22, 26 and 31-36 of co-pending and commonly assigned patent application no. 10/947,334. A Preliminary Amendment has been filed in the co-pending application canceling the conflicting claims to obviate this rejection.

Regarding priority of invention, the Examiner is informed that commonly assigned co-pending application 10/947,334 has the same inventors as the present application. The inventor Sang Jin Yun in the present application has been listed as Sang Jin Yoon in application no. 10/947,334. The last name of this inventor can be spelled differently, but is in fact the same name. Therefore, the inventors of the present application are also the inventors of patent application no. 10/947,334.

Serial No. **10/673,282**

Docket No. **YHK-0120**

Amdt. dated August 31, 2006

Reply to Office Action of June 7, 2006

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that claims 1-10 and 12-22 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, Frederick D. Bailey, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim  
Registration No. 36,186  
Frederick D. Bailey  
Registration No. 42,282

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
(703) 766-3701 DYK/FDB:tlg

**Date: September 7, 2006**

\\Fk4\Documents\2017\2017-108\97464.doc

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**